

REMARKS

1. In response to the Office Action mailed March 21, 2007, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. Claims 1, 2, 4 through 6, 8 through 20 and 22 through 29 were last presented for examination. Claims 1, 2, 4 through 6, 8 through 20 and 22 through 29 were rejected in the outstanding Office Action. By the foregoing Amendments, 1, 20 and 25 claims have been amended. Claims 30 and 31 have been added. No claims have been cancelled. Thus, upon entry of this paper, claims 1, 2, 4 through 6, 8 through 20, and 22 through 31 will be pending in this application. Of these twenty-eight (28) claims, three (3) claims (claims 1, 20 and 25) are independent. Based on the above Amendments and following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the outstanding objections and rejections be reconsidered, and that they be withdrawn.

Art of Record

2. Applicants thank the Examiner for returning form PTO/SB/08a filed by Applicants on January 16, 2007 which have been initialed by the Examiner indicating consideration of the references cited therein.

Drawings

3. Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's indication that the drawings filed on June 26, 2003 have been accepted as formal drawings.

Claim Rejections under Section 101

4. Independent claim 25 and dependent claims 26 through 29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. This rejection is obviated by the amendment to claim 25.

Claim Rejections under Section 103

5. Independent claims 1, 20, and 25 and dependent claims 2, 4 through 6, 8 through 19, 22 through 24, and 26 through 29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,617,872 to Vogley (hereinafter, "Vogley") in view of U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0130969 to Hawkins *et al.* (hereinafter, "Hawkins"). Based

upon the above Amendments and following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.

6. Independent claim 1, as amended, recites, in part, “wherein the plurality of components are operably connected within said electronic system such that no invasive connection is necessary to apply the one or more test frequencies.” (*See*, Applicant’s Claim 1, above). Independent claims 20 and 25 also claim a similar feature. In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner relied on Vogley as allegedly disclosing a “digital frequency synthesizer to ... generate one or more test frequency ... for application to one or more of a plurality of components of said electronic system.” (*See*, Office Action at 3). However, the cited portions of Vogley fail to teach or suggest the plurality of components are operably connected within said electronic system such that no invasive connection is necessary to apply the one or more test frequencies as claimed. Instead, the cited portions of Vogley show an integrated circuit 24, 25 that is plugged into a test socket 30, 31. (*See*, Vogley Col. 2, lines 57-64 and FIG. 1). The integrated circuits of Vogley require an invasive connection, *i.e.* test socket, to receive the test frequencies. The Examiner acknowledged the invasive connection of Vogley by stating that “Vogley teaches multiple devices under test (*i.e.* components) which ***are installed on a test handler board*** (*i.e.* electronic system).” (*See*, Office Action at 7; emphasis added). Further integrated circuits are not operably connected with the electronic system because in Vogley the integrated circuits are removed and tested outside of an operate connection within their electronic system. Hawkins is only cited by the Examiner for teaching a baseboard management controller, and Hawkins cannot cure the deficiencies of Vogley. (*See*, Office Action at 4). Therefore, without further addressing the appropriateness of the combination of Vogley and Hawkins, the Examiner has failed to cite a single reference or combination of references that teach or suggest every element of independent claims 1, 20 and 25.

Dependent Claims

7. The dependent claims incorporate all of the subject matter of their respective independent claims and add additional subject matter which makes them *a fortiori* independently patentable over the art of record. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the outstanding rejections of the dependent claims be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Conclusion

8. In view of the foregoing, this application should be in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ajay A. Jagtiani/
Ajay A. Jagtiani
Reg. No. 35,205
Tel. (703) 591-2664

June 20, 2007